

REMARKS

Claim 8 is cancelled. Claims 17 and 9-21 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 11, 13, 14, and 21 are amended herein. Applicant believes no new matter is introduced by way of the amendment.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the allowability of claims 8 and 9 if rewritten in independent form. The subject matter of claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form as amended claim 1, and claim 8 has been cancelled. Claim 9 is now dependent on claim 1. Applicant believes claim 1 and all claims dependent therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 13, 14, and 21 have also been amended to include the subject matter of claim 8. Applicant believes claims 13, 14, 21, and all claims dependent therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Claim Objections

Claims 11 and 12 were objected to for a typographical error in claim 11, upon which claim 12 is dependent. Claim 13 was also objected to for typographical errors. The errors have been corrected in an amendment filed herein.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant directs the Examiner to paragraphs 56-57 and Figures 6B, 6C, 7B and 7C of the specification. The examples therein clearly illustrate the claimed subject matter.

Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 7, 13-17, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duinker (US 4,266,136).

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duinker in further view of Dafni (US 5,966,422).

The Examiner has rejected claims 6 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duinker in further view of Hoffman (US 6,859,514).

The Examiner has rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duinker in further view of Gordon et al. (US 5,864,553).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the above rejections, and reserves the right to pursue the originally submitted claims in a continuing application.


Considering the amendments filed herein, Applicant believes the above rejections no longer apply. Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1- 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Stephen M. De Klerk at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Any necessary extension of time for response not already requested is hereby requested. Please charge any corresponding fee to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



Stephen M. De Klerk
Reg. No. 46,503

Date: September 16, 2005

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300

François R. Gaultier, et al.
Application No.: 10/791,470